

REMARKS

This amendment is being submitted with a Request for Continued Examination.

This amendment uses the revised format allowed in the PTO notice entitled “Amendments in a Revised Format Now Permitted” dated January 31, 2003.

Claims 18-35 are pending in this application. Claims 18-20, 24-28, 30-32, and 35 have been rejected. Claims 21-23, 29, and 33-34 have been objected to. Claims 18-35 have been amended.

Claims 18-20, 24-28, 30-32, and 35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,078,100 *Duesman et al.* (“*Duesman*”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 18-35 have been amended merely to clarify the layers, and specifically to change “intermediate” layer to –wiring– layer. Claims 19, 24-26, 28, 31-32, and 34-35 have been amended merely to clarify the uppermost and lowermost layers and specifically to add –wiring–.

As understood, *Duesman* discloses a routing for a flip-chip. Figure 4a is a cross-sectional view showing the routing of a “jumping” trace 122 that connects internal traces 132A and 132C. (column 5, lines 35-45). The thickness of the internal traces 132 is described.

In the office action, a contact that is an unlabelled element in Figure 4 has been given Examiner’s label #1, and a layer is given the Examiner’s label number #2. It is unclear where, if anywhere, these unlabeled elements are described in *Duesman*. Applicant asserts that Examiner’s label #1 is not a layer as noted, but label #1 instead is a via or contact plug.

Claims 18 and 27 have been amended to clarify the first and second wiring layers. Claims 18 and 27 recite the second wiring layer having a thickness thinner than that of the first

wiring layer. *Duesman* does not disclose or even suggest wiring layers having different thickness as recited in claims 18 and 27. In fact, *Duesman* is silent on thickness of the wiring.

Lacking this claimed feature, *Duesman* can render claims 18 and 27 unpatentable. Claims 19-26 depend directly or indirectly on independent claim 18 and claims 28-35 depend directly or indirectly on new independent claim 27, for similar reasons the references cannot render claims 18-35 unpatentable. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 18-35 are patentable over the references of record.

Claims 21-23, 29, and 33-34 have been objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 21-23, 29, and 33-34 have been amended in view of the amendment of the base claims. Applicants reserve the right to add claims based on allowable claims 21-23, 29 and 33-34.

It is submitted that claims 18-35 are allowable, and allowance and issuance of this application is respectfully requested.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees necessary for extensions of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 07-1896, referencing 2102475-991160.

Dated: May 27, 2003

GRAY CARY WARE & FREIDENRICH LLP

By _____

Edward B. Weller

Edward B. Weller
Reg. No. 37,468
Attorney for Applicants

ATTN: Patent Department
GRAY CARY WARE & FREIDENRICH LLP
1755 Embarcadero Road
Palo Alto, CA 94303-3340
Tel: (650) 833-2436
Fax: (650) 320-7401